UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,794	03/26/2004	Takayuki Kobayashi	071469-0103	7137
22428 FOLEY AND L	7590 02/23/2007 ARDNER LLP		EXAM	INER
			EASHOO, MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		1732	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
2 MON	NTUC	02/23/2007	PAI	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			5/		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_ <i>U</i>		
	10/809,794	KOBAYASHI, TAKAYUKI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for Reply	VIC CET TO EVDIDE AMONTH	(C) OD TUIDTY (20) DAVE			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 N	November 2006.				
	s action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	ance except for formal matters, pro	osecution as to the merits is			
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the application) .				
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7 is/are withdrawn	from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-12</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	and a decide a second				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,				
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreigr a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 					
application from the International Burea		ad in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	* **	· ed.			
•					
Attachment(c)					
Attachment(s) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO_413)			
2) Delice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	ate			
B) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2 ea.</u> .	5)	atent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/809,794 - Non-Final

Art Unit: 1732

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claims 8-12 in the reply filed on 28-NOV-2006 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 1-7 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected claim grouping, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 28-NOV-2006.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed 26-MAR-2004 and 18-JAN-2007 comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Accordingly, they have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koganezawa et al. (US Pat. 5,489,409).

Regarding claim 8: Koganezawa et al. teaches a method of extrusion, comprising: a molding system including a die having a opening with both variable and invariable portions (Fig. 6-17); a gear pump (9:14-25); and conducting first and second control sequences to control the shape of the variable die portion and adjusting the gear pump in synchronism with the change in shape (Fig. 1 and 8:30-9:25).

It is inherent, for operability of the gear pump, that the gear pump is located between the die and an extruder.

Regarding claim 9: Koganezawa et al. teaches changing the extruder/screw speed (6:50-55).

Regarding claim 10: It is inherent of Koganezawa et al. that the lag time of the extruder speed and flow would be accounted for during the control sequence in order for the process of Koganezawa et al. to function as desired (ie. increased accuracy of product shape).

Art Unit: 1732

Regarding claim 11: Koganezawa et al. teaches use of a pressure sensor as part of the control system (9:20-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koganezawa et al. (US Pat. 5,489,409) in view of Ito et al. (US Pat. 5,447,670).

Koganezawa et al. teaches the basic claimed process as set forth above.

Koganezawa et al. does not teach opening and closing a value mechanism to control material flow. However, Ito et al. teaches opening and closing a value mechanism to control material flow (11:15-12:35 and Figs. 20-22). Koganezawa et al. and Ito et al. are combinable because they are from the same filed of endeavor, namely, extruding products having variable shaped cross-sections. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to have opened and closed a value mechanism to control material flow, as taught by Ito et al., in the process of Koganezawa et al., and would have been motivated to do so because Ito et al. suggests that this is an equivalent and alternative means of supplying material to a region that changes shape and also has a thickened portion.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1197. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3pm EST, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732

19-Feb-07 19/56/07

me